DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 333 306 CG 023 461

AUTHOR Smith, Elaine F.
TITLE Toward Greater Success for Minority Students on Predominantly White College Campuses.
PUB DATE Aug 90
NOTE 96p.; Master of Education report, University of Texas at Austin.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Undetermined (040) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; *Black Students; *College Students; *Higher Education; Minority Groups; Racial Discrimination; Racial Factors; Student College Relationship

ABSTRACT

This report focuses on minority students, particularly African Americans, in higher education. It examines school desegregation and its effect on African Americans, the success rate of minorities in comparison to the majority population, retention issues relative to minorities, recruitment and retention programs, and the importance of multicultural and culturally pluralistic academic environments. Data are presented which reveal that minority students, especially African American students, enter college with educational deficits resulting from earlier years of schooling. It is also revealed that: (1) minorities' grades and test scores were lower, and their occupational goals were more limited than of Whites; (2) while in college, minorities experienced higher rates of attrition, lower enrollment at prestigious institutions, and underrepresentation in the science, engineering, and professional fields; and (3) minorities reported greater emotional and social stress, and less satisfaction with college in general than their White contemporaries. It is recommended that institutions of higher learning address these situations that hamper the educational achievement of African Americans and other non-Whites and develop financial aid programs, expand special programs designed to address the needs of African Americans, and involve faculty in the recruitment and retention of minority students. (BHK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED333306

TOWARD GREATER SUCCESS FOR MINORITY STUDENTS ON PREDOMINANTLY WHITE COLLEGE CAMPUSES

by

Elaine F. Smith, B.A.

REPORT

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the requirements

for the Degree of

Master of Education

CG023461

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN

August, 1990

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☑ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Elaine Smith

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TOWARD GREATER SUCCESS

FOR MINORITY STUDENTS

ON PREDOMINANTLY WHITE COLLEGE CAMPUSES

APPROVED:

Supervisor: John Warfield

Dr. John Warfield

Richard Mowsesian

Dr. Richard Mowsesian

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	Introduction	1
	A. An Historic Overview	1
	B. School Desegregation	10
	C. Minorities and Higher Education	16
II.	Retention Issues	29
	A. Variables That Affect Success	29
	1. Racism	45
	2. Socioeconomic Issues	52
	B. Counselor's Role	54
III.	Recruitment and Retention Programs	62
IV.	Multicultural Education and Cultural Pluralism	77
V.	Conclusion	84
	References	87

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

AN HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

In 1787, the Constitution of the United States was written. This plan for America's government was based on the concept that all men are created equal. Yet, this important document was signed by men who agreed that a slave was to be counted only as three-fifths of a man. It took a civil war to alter that agreement and to change the Constitution so that it affirmed that every man counted as a whole person. It took more than a hundred years of struggle after the Constitution was adopted to get America's laws and courts to agree with the 13th, 14th and 15th amendments - amendments which, respectively, abolished slavery, allowed citizenship for African Americans and gave African Americans the right to vote.

During these years, several litigations set historical precedents. Each legal fight provided a closer step toward justice and equality. The steps have been painfully slow and have not been consistent. Some have been giant strides; others have been small steps, and at times; there

has been no notable movement in the African American's battle for equality in American society. The wheels of justice, however, have slowly continued to turn.

One route on the long journey to equality began in 1896 when the United States Supreme Court decided in the renown Plessy vs Ferguson case that African Americans could be segregated in separate cars on the railroad without violating the constitutional rights of anyone - provided that the accommodations for the two races were equal (National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 1971).

Using that decision as a precedent, many states quickly provided "separate but equal" accommodations and made it illegal for either race to use the facilities reserved for the other. Hospitals, drinking fountains, theaters, hotels, restaurants, school and colleges - everything available for public use was racially segregated.

These segregation (Jim Crow) laws set the tone for race relations in the United States, making it an accepted and common practice to deny African Americans white-collar, professional jobs along side whites, residence in nice white neighborhoods, and entrance into white schools and

colleges. These denials resulted in the economical and educational oppression of African Americans. This oppression in turn led to gross educational and economic deficiencies. These deficiencies subsequently served to perpetuate the idea that African Americans were inferior to whites and thus maintained and broadened the social gap that existed between the races by virtue of the Jim Crow laws and customs which kept the races physically separated.

The impact of the Jim Crow laws was profoundly felt in every segment of American society. Most severely affected was the educational system which, because of Jim Crow laws, denied African Americans equal educational opportunity. For example, one landmark case - the Gaines case - epitomizes the affect of Jim Crow laws relative to higher education for African Americans. The case shows America's stance almost forty years after Plessy and the Jim Crow laws.

Briefly, the Gaines case resulted from a series of events which took place in 1935 when Lloyd Gaines was refused admission to the law school of the University of Missouri because of his race. Gaines took legal action to compel the university to admit him, claiming that refusal to do so was a denial of the equal protection clause of the

Fourteenth Amendment. The Missouri Supreme Court dismissed Gaines' arguments and dismissed his case. However, attorneys for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) appealed the case to the U.S. Supreme Court, and the decision was reversed on the grounds that the Constitution required the state of Missouri to provide equal facilities for African Americans within the state. Since Missouri had no law schools for African Americans, it had to admit Gaines to the existing University of Missouri Law School (NAACP, 1971).

This decision came forty-two years after Plessy vs Ferguson, and it was the Supreme Court's first step away from the "separate but equal" doctrine.

Yet, there were many more steps to be taken before African Americans would be granted equal education opportunities. An Oklahoma professor, G. W. McLaurin, wanted to get his doctorate from the public university in his home state. Under the protection of the court decision in the Gaines' case, Mr. McLaurin was admitted to the all-white graduate school of the University of Oklahoma. Since the state did not have a separate doctoral program for African Americans but did have segregation laws, McLaurin had to bear the burden of severe racial discrimination

while at the university. During classes, McLaurin had to sit at a separate desk (in an anteroom) where he could see and hear the professor through an open door without being seen by other students. He sat in a specified desk on the mezzanine floor in the library and ate his meals at a special table in the cafeteria and at different times from all the other students.

After nation-wide public criticism bombarded the university regarding such blatant treatment, Mr. McLaurin's situation was changed, but it was not corrected. Mr. McLaurin was allowed to sit inside the classroom, but he had to sit in a row of chairs labelled "colored". His library seat was moved to the main floor but was still separately assigned. He was allowed to eat his meals at the same time as all other students but only at assigned, separate tables.

National attention to McLaurin's problems propelled his case through the legal system all the way to the Supreme Court. After the Supreme Court took a good look at the ridiculousness of such segregation, it asserted the following:

> We conclude that the conditions which (McLaurin) is required to receive his education deprive him of his personal and present right to the equal protection of the

> laws. We hold that under these circumstances the 14th amendment precludes differences in treatment by the state based upon race. (McLaurin) having been admitted to a state-supported graduate school, must receive the same treatment at the hands of the state as students of other races (NAACP, 1971, pg. 7).

After this Supreme Court statement was issued, other states soon began to create "instant" law schools and graduate schools for African Americans. For example, Texas created a separate law school for a few African Americans. Heman Sweatt was one of those few.

Sweatt was also the plaintiff in a lawsuit brought against the state, demanding that Texas drop its subterfuge in establishing "instant" schools for African Americans and open its real law schools to them.

Ultimately, the Supreme Court declared:

> This court has stated unanimously that 'The state must provide (legal education) for (petitioners) in conformity with the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment and provide it as soon as it does for applicants of other groups. In accordance with (decided cases) petitioner may claim his full constitutional right: legal education equivalent to that offered by the state to students of other races. Such education is not available to him in a separate law school as offered by the state.' (NAACP, 1971, p.8).

Hence, it seemed to many that there was only one way to assure equal protection of the laws, and that was to

provide equal educational facilities, but the question was raised: can separate be equal?

In 1954 that question was addressed and answered when the Supreme Court ruled in Brown vs Topeka Board of Education and proclaimed that public schools would be desegregated. It declared that the very fact of segregation denoted inequality. In part, the decision read:

> We come then to the question presented: Does segregation of children in public schools solely on the basis of race, even though the physical facilities and other 'tangible' factors may be equal, deprive children of the minority group of educational opportunities? We believe it does.
> We conclude that in the field of public education the doctrine of 'separate but equal' has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal. (NAACP, 1971, p.8).

In 1955 the federal district court in North Carolina ruled that Brown applied to higher education as well (Bailey, 1978).

Another litigation related to higher education was the 1964 Civil Rights Act. The Civil Rights Act said, in part: "No person shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin ... be denied the benefit of any program or activity receiving federal assistance" (Civil Rights Act, 1970).

Further, in 1968 the Office of Civil Rights of the Health Education and Welfare Department contacted institutions and apprised them that their federal contracts and grants would be cancelled if segregation continued. Moreover, in the early 1970's the Equal Opportunity Commission (EEOC), the Department of Labor, the Department of HEW, and other federal agencies began to require institutions to have "numerical proportions" of ethnic minorities and women, equal to the percentages in the population (Bailey, 1978).

These numerical requirements imposed pressures on many colleges and universities. Subsequently, the doors of the numerous predominantly white institutions swung open to African Americans and other minority groups, giving them greater access to higher education.

Consequently, African American enrollment in colleges increased dramatically during the 1970's. The number of African Americans enrolled in institutions of higher learning increased from 522,000 in 1970 to over 1 million by 1980 (Ploski and Williams, 1983).

Indeed, the Civil Rights Act of the 1960's addressed some of the wrongs imposed on African American citizens for centuries. Allowing African Americans greater access to

higher education was seen as an essential solution to the problem of racial inequality. Regrettably, today - more than twenty years after the Civil Rights Movement - research shows that accessing predominantly white institutions of higher education has not afforded African Americans greater achievement and/or more successful educational experiences.

The overall enrollment of African Americans in four year predominantly white institutions has fallen short of projected goals and is steadily declining (Allen, 1989). Further, those minorities who do enroll in U.S. colleges and universities are increasingly dropping out before earning their degrees. A Ford Foundation study (reported in the Chronicle of Higher Education, February 3, 1982) pointed out that nationally only 42% of minority students entering college go on to complete their degrees while approximately 60% of white students do so (Taylor, 1987).

This single statistic indicates that there is a serious problem or series of problems that prohibit the minority students' academic attainment.

Thus, the focus of this report is on the minority student, particularly African Americans in higher education. This report will examine school desegregation

and its affect on African Americans, the success rate of minorities in comparison to the majority population, retention issues relative to minorities, recruitment and retention programs, and the importance of multicultural and culturally pluralistic academic environments.

SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

In the late 1960's and 70's, the news media and politicians used the terms desegregation and integration synonymously when they referred to African Americans and white students attending schools together. However, as African Americans and whites started sharing the same schools and classrooms, politicians, newsmen, and everyone else soon realized that the terms are not synonymous. People readily began to conclude that in Brown vs. Topeka, the Supreme Court had mandated desegregation (the physical mixing of the races) but did not have the authority or power to mandate integration (the process of mutual acceptance of, and respect for other races and includes some level of cultural assimilation between races). (Hughes, Gordon and Hillman, 1980).

Hughes, Gordon and Hillman (1980) show that even though desegregation has occurred in most schools, there are few signs of integration.

The literature suggests that this lack of integration is one of the key factors that accounts for the poor success rate experienced by African Americans and other minorities in American educational institutions.

As the courts mandated desegregation and school districts implemented desegregation plans, little or no consideration was given to plans for social integration and to ways to assist minorities, particularly African American students who had previously attended poor and deficient segregated schools where they had received inadequate training which left them academically unprepared to perform successfully along side whites in newly desegregated classes.

The courts and desegregation policy makers failed to address the issue of economic and intellectual segregation which permeated desegregated schools. That is, they did not give attention to intellectual segregation within schools as evidenced by academic tracking and ability grouping based on test scores - scores that invariably resulted in a high percentage of African Americans being

placed in low ability classes which in turn created resegregation within schools. Use of these scores penalized African Americans who had academic deficiencies resulting from their former enrollment in segregated school.

Hughes (1980) and his associates contend that resegregation on intellectual grounds is as damaging to students as desegregation on racial grounds without social integration. They state that the literature reveals a self-fulfilling prophecy given teachers' expectations and students' self perceptions. Their contention is that the self-fulfilling prophecy adversely affects the learning and teaching of minority students.

Hence, the conclusion is that intellectual segregation (tracking and ability grouping) puts minority students at a gross disadvantage, with many teachers seeing them as incapable of quality work and performance due to their "deficiencies", and subsequently, teachers often lower their demands and expectations of minority students, which further handicaps them. Or, on the other hand, the students perceive themselves as slow and academically inferior as compared to white students who have been afforded better educational opportunities. Thus,

resegregation (tracking, ability grouping) has also resulted in low self-esteem or poor self-concept for minorities which in turn has led to loss of interest, failure, or poor achievement.

In essence, the basic problems that African Americans faced in desegregated schools can be categorized as problems that were related to the instructional programs, co-curricular activities and school climate. That is, frequently minority students had limited educational opportunities due to the fact that most attended schools that were not as good as the schools white students attended - schools that lacked adequate books, equipment, supplies and resources. This deficiency in the educational background of minority students caused problems in desegregated schools where the instructional programs did not recognize and address the academic weaknesses of their minority enrollment.

Additionally, African American students fell victim to institutional racism in desegregated schools. They faced social factors, organizational practices, procedures and rules that kept them in an inferior status. For example, a school that required high laboratory fees, wittingly or unwittingly practiced institutional racism because such a

requirement served to keep economically deprived students (minorities) from participation in certain courses (Hughes and Associates, 1980).

Moreover, participation in co-curricular or extra-curricular activities in desegregated schools was very limited for minority students because of certain school practices. For instance, frequently standards for cheerleaders were based on skill training given at paid clinics; selection procedures were often such that whites made the critical choices; i.e. students must purchase uniforms, students must finance trips. In student government activities, there were such prohibiting factors as methods of election, eligibility requirements, faculty approval and arbitrary quota systems (Hughes and Associates, 1980).

Frederick Venditti (Bailey, 1978, p. 102) stated the following regarding school climate in a desegregated school:

> The desegregated school, first of all, is a place where the majority race dominates the life of the school. It establishes and maintains the social system and sets the intellectual climate, the dress, values, and behavioral codes of the school. The members of the majority race are a part of the mainstream of life in the school and obtain substantial rewards in the form of privileges, prerogative,

> status and material symbols. By contrast and by definition members of the minority group are outside the mainstream and away from its benefits.

This quotation quite accurately describes situations that existed throughout the U.S. as schools desegregated - situations that minority students had to cope with on a daily basis. There is little doubt that such circumstances and conditions would negatively affect students' performance, self-esteem, and educational achievement.

Basically, the educational experiences for African Americans in desegregated schools can best be characterized in the following quote found in Institutional Racism in America (1969, p. 34).

> Within the present educational apparatus, black students suffer from institutionalized discrimination in many ways but particularly in IQ testing, classroom ability grouping, and negative teacher attitudes. The combined effect of these factors is a progressive lessening in the child's self-esteem as he proceeds through school. Further, with each socioeconomic group, the self-esteem of black children is less than that of white children. The self-concepts of black children of the ghetto, who bear the double stigma of blackness and poverty are consistently lowest of all. The result of this process is a steady decline in academic performance, particularly in the critical skills of verbal and reading ability...

As these minority students continued in desegregated schools, they remained on academic tracks that perpetuated their problems and left them academically unprepared for college as well as not equipped to meet the other challenges of college, i.e. social adjustment and transition to life away from home. Those who decided to attend predominantly white colleges and universities - schools that gave them access to higher educational opportunity but were frequently not prepared and/or willing to meet the specific needs of minority students, (i.e. offer strong mentor programs and retention services) were ultimately bound to encounter severe problems. These problems hindered their ability to stay afloat academically, emotionally, and socially on predominantly white college campuses.

MINORITIES AND HIGHER EDUCATION

A study conducted by Walter Allen (1988) set forth statistical data regarding minorities in higher education in the state of Michigan. Research shows that the data collected by Allen is reflective of trends in higher education nationwide. Allen's data reveal that in 1970 there were 7,586 African Americans enrolled in Michigan's

public universities, making up 5.3% of the total student body. Asian, Hispanic, and American Indian students combined totaled 1,784, with each group accounting for less that .5% of the total student enrollment. Of all the students in Michigan's public universities and colleges, 93% were white. By 1976, there were 15,521 African American students on the campuses of Michigan's public colleges and universities - twice as many as in 1970, rendering a total of 9.4% of the total enrollment. White students were 86% of the total enrollment, and American Indians, Asians, and Hispanics were, respectively, 5%, 6% and 8% of total enrollment. As of 1986, the absolute number of African American students in Michigan's public institutions had grown to 16,500 although their percentage of the total population had declined to 7%. The Asian (1.8%) and Hispanic (1.2%) fractions had grown while the American Indian (.5%) and white student (85.2%) fractions had remained stable.

In summary, the enrollment of African Americans in Michigan's four-year public university undergraduate programs increased rapidly from 5% of the total enrollment in 1970 to a peak of 11% in 1976, declined steadily since then to a 1986 level of 7%. Also reflected in Allen's

study is that African Americans are disproportionately represented among students who attend two-year junior or community colleges. Many do not complete the requirements for an associate degree and many do not transfer into four-year institutions. Moreover, the students enrolled in two-year public colleges are generally weaker academically, come from poorer economic backgrounds and do not earn degrees beyond the high school diploma. African American students in Michigan higher education were found to be more likely to attend four-year colleges as they are to attend two-year colleges.

Additionally, Allen's study shows that in 1976, the number of students in graduate school in public institutions in Michigan was 46,261. By 1985, the number had declined to 37,140, a reduction of 20%. The African American graduate student population dropped from 7% (3,178) to 5% (1,881) of the total enrollment.

The statistics for degrees earned at Michigan's colleges and universities continue to reflect the downward slide in the achievement of African Americans in higher education. Degrees earned by African Americans from 1976-1986 declined in every category (bachelors, masters,

doctoral, professional and associate) except for associate degrees, where earned degrees increased by 140.

In brief, African Americans earned a total of 1,041 fewer degrees from Michigan schools in 1986 than in 1976, while Asians doubled the number of degrees earned in each category, and whites were also successful in increasing their number of earned degrees (Allen, 1988).

Further, Gary Orfield (1988) examined trends in white and minority students' experiences in high school, community colleges, and in the universities of the greater Los Angeles area since the mid-1970's. He concludes that African Americans and Hispanics' access to educational mobility has been hampered by high rates of high school drop outs, by increasingly rigorous college admission standards, the high cost of attending four-year public colleges, and by a deemphasis on minority recruitment and retention programs.

Orfield contends that metropolitan Los Angeles is the center of Hispanic life in the United States since almost one-fifth of the nation's Hispanic population live in Los Angeles. He asserts that Los Angeles is the most important center of African American settlement in the West and is second to San Francisco as a center of the Asian

population. Orfield concludes that Los Angeles is becoming the most racially and ethnically cosmopolitan metropolis in the United States. He reports that one American in 20 lives in the Los Angeles metropolitan area. Thus, what is depicted in Orfield's study may be used to characterize our national multi-ethnic society.

The data (Orfield, 1988) show that African Americans and Hispanics attend very different schools from those serving whites and Asians. African Americans and Hispanics are highly concentrated in schools with very poor records of success. In addition, African American students are highly segregated and Hispanics are becoming segregated from whites. On the other hand, Asian students are not segregated but attend a wide range of schools and are concentrated in predominantly white schools.

Orfield reports that in metropolitan Los Angeles racial and ethnic segregation is strongly related to economic segregation and both are highly related to all assessments of educational inequality among schools. The separate schools are found to be unequal in terms of graduation rates, number of students who fail to be promoted, attendance level, and test scores.

Orfield asserts that hundreds of thousands of minority students never make it into the college-eligible population. Only the top seventh of the state's high school graduates are eligible for the University of California system, and the majority of the others are ineligible for the remaining four-year bachelor degree-granting institutions, the California State University system. The remaining students (the majority of whom are African American and Hispanic) who make it into college in the state of California are enrolled in a community college system, from which few earn degrees or certificates and few transfer successfully and go on to earn bachelor degrees.

Moreover, the study shows that between 1980 and 1984 African American and Hispanic enrollment at four-year colleges declined substantially relative to high school graduates. Orfield claims that the long-standing educational and economic advantages of whites account for these results and reflect the impact of long-term racial discrimination. He explains the success of Asian students by alluding to cultural differences and the role of education values. He points out that the 1965 Immigration Act was designed to permit only extraordinary Asian families to immigrate to the United States. Excluding the

Indochinese refugees who were admitted after the end of the Vietnam War, most immigrants from Asia have been highly educated and wealthy. Hence, Orfield makes two assertions: (1) Asian families place strong emphasis on education and demand success from their children, and (2) the Asians who are in America's schools and colleges are, for the most part, those from a very selective group.

Further, data complied by the Office of Institutional Studies at the University of Texas - Austin, Table 1, (University of Texas, 1989), show that, on average African Americans and Hispanic freshmen have higher attrition rates than white, Asian American, and foreign freshmen. Progression charts covering first time freshmen enrollment from 1980 - 1987 show that African American freshmen had the highest dismissal rates.

The progression charts reveal that after one year, almost one out of every five freshmen has left the University. After five years, more than one-half of the entering African American freshmen and a lower percentage of Hispanic freshmen have left, while slightly more than one-third of white freshmen and less than one-third of Asian Americans and foreign freshmen have left. Average graduation rates are highest for foreign, Asian American

and white students (66%, 60%, and 56% after five years) and lowest for African American and Hispanic students (35% and 43%, respectively, after five years),(University of Texas, 1989).

In fact, the ethnic/foreign comparison shows that foreign and Asian freshmen have the highest graduation rates, followed by white and Hispanic freshmen. Among transfers, foreign students have the highest graduation rates, followed by whites, Hispanic, and Asian American students. African American freshmen and transfer students have the lowest graduates rates. (See Table 1).

While some statistics show that African American participation in higher education in the United States dramatically increased in the 1970's, other statistics reveal dismal data relative to the quality of matriculation and the end product - college graduation. For example, in the fall of 1976 African American students comprised 8.4% of the full-time undergraduate enrollment in the United States; four years later only 6.4% of the baccalaureate degrees were conferred on African American students. Furthermore, the rates of access, participation, and graduation decline as the levels in advanced higher education rises (i.e. fewer African American masters degree

The University of Texas at Austin
Office of Institutional Studies

Table 1

COMPARISON OF AVERAGE PROGRESSION RATES* FOR FIRST-TIME FRESHMEN
Percent at Each Level of Progress

Level of Progress	WHITE	BLACK	HISPANIC	ASIAN AMERICAN	FOREIGN	ALL FRESHMEN
DISMISSED						
After one year	6.0	14.5	7.4	4.5	.8	6.4
After two years	7.8	19.8	11.6	5.0	1.8	8.6
After three years	9.3	24.3	15.1	8.0	2.3	10.5
After four years	10.1	27.3	16.1	9.3	4.5	11.5
After five years	10.5	30.2	17.0	9.9	6.0	12.0
After six years	11.1	28.2	17.3	9.9	6.3	12.3
DROPPED OUT OF UT						
After one year	11.4	9.0	13.5	8.1	11.4	11.4
After two years	18.9	14.3	19.9	13.4	16.3	18.5
After three years	21.4	17.7	23.8	17.6	19.1	21.4
After four years	24.1	21.9	26.8	18.7	20.1	24.0
After five years	25.1	26.4	28.7	20.6	21.1	25.3
After six years	25.4	25.6	30.5	22.0	20.6	25.8
SUBTOTAL - TOTAL ATTRITION**						
After one year	17.4	23.4	20.8	12.6	12.2	17.8
After two years	26.6	34.1	31.5	18.4	18.1	27.1
After three years	30.7	42.0	38.8	25.6	21.4	31.9
After four years	34.2	49.1	43.0	27.7	24.6	35.5
After five years	35.6	56.7	45.8	30.6	27.1	37.3
After six years	36.5	53.8	47.8	31.9	26.9	38.0
CONTINUING						
After one year	82.6	76.6	79.2	87.4	87.8	82.2
After two years	73.4	65.9	68.5	81.6	81.3	72.9
After three years	67.8	57.8	59.4	72.0	67.6	66.5
After four years	32.2	34.4	35.4	38.7	24.8	32.7
After five years	8.7	8.6	11.3	9.4	6.9	8.9
After six years	3.7	4.7	4.3	3.4	3.3	3.7
GRADUATED						
After one year	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0
After two years	.0	.0	.0	.0	.6	.0
After three years	1.5	.2	1.7	2.4	10.9	1.7
After four years	33.6	16.5	21.7	33.6	50.6	31.8
After five years	55.8	34.7	42.9	60.0	66.0	53.8
After six years	59.8	41.6	47.9	64.7	69.8	58.2

* Rates are based on 1980-1997 Entering Cohorts
**Total attrition is the sum of students who are dismissed and those who drop out

OIS 3/99

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

students and still fewer African American doctoral students (Williams, 1980).

While African Americans represented 10.2% of the undergraduate enrollment in the fall of 1976, the African American percentage in graduate schools was 6%. Enrollment in professional schools was only 4.5%; only 3.5% of the doctorates were awarded to African Americans, and only 8.4% of the associate degrees were awarded to African Americans.

Moreover, the following statistics from the fall of 1976 (Williams, 1980) reflect that African Americans' participation in higher education does not equate to achievement and successful goal attainment:

- The level of undergraduate enrollment of African Americans is approaching their percentages in the general population; yet African Americans are severely under-represented in higher degree levels. African Americans constituted 4.5% of the total first-year professional enrollment and 6% of the graduate enrollment. In the South, the figures were 5.4% and 10.1%, respectively.
- At all levels, African Americans are still under-represented in certain fields. In 1976, African Americans represented 5% of the enrollment in

engineering; 2.0% in veterinary medicine; 4.3% in physical sciences; 4.0% of the enrollment in dentistry; 5.9% in medicine; and 4.5% in law.

- Approximately 42% of all African American students enrolled at all levels of higher education were in two-year community colleges compared with one-third of all white students enrolled.
- Forty-five percent of all African American undergraduates were in two-year colleges as were 55% of all African American first-time freshmen.
- Fifteen percent of all African American students in higher education were enrolled at the university level compared with 25% of all students.
- Of the approximately 400,000 African American students enrolled in four year, post secondary degree granting institutions, 50% or more than 200,000 were attending one of the 107 historically African American colleges or universities. The other 50% were attending predominantly white colleges and universities throughout the United States.

- At the doctoral level, more than three times as many degrees were conferred to non-resident aliens than to African Americans (Williams, 1980).

An analysis of the data on African Americans in higher education shows that they are (1) underrepresented in four-year colleges and universities, (2) continuing to enroll in traditional fields such as social science and education, which limits their opportunities for employment and career advancement in today's technologically advanced society, and (3) are underrepresented in technical and professional fields. Specifically, research shows that African Americans are under-represented in the fields of medicine, dentistry, law and engineering. The data also show that most African Americans who earn degrees in medicine, dentistry, and law earn them at predominantly African American colleges and universities (Williams, 1980). This raises the question of why these students are not as successful at completion of their degree programs at predominantly white schools? The fact that historically African American colleges and universities still award a disproportionate percentage of degrees earned by African

Americans suggests that the open door (predominantly white institutions' admission of African Americans) is a revolving door, which provides access but not degrees to thousands of African Americans.

Reflections upon the question of why African Americans are not making similar accomplishments at predominantly white institutions, leads to a more direct question: What are the variables which affect minority students' college success?

CHAPTER TWO

RETENTION ISSUES

VARIABLES THAT AFFECT SUCCESS

Research reveals that there are several variables that help to determine the likelihood of students succeeding in college. These variables are numbered as:

1) **Personal Characteristics.** The main personal characteristics that predict success are intellectual ability and prior academic achievement. Motivation, values, and emotional stability are also cited as important attributes for college success (Upcraft, 1988). In brief, students who have records of previous high academic achievement, strong motivation, values consistent with the values of middle-class America, and emotional balance are deemed more likely to success in college that those without such qualities.

2) **Demographic Characteristics.** Demographic characteristics such as gender, age and race play significant roles in determining success in college. In general, whites have a better chance of succeeding than other races (Astin, 1972).

3) **Cultural Characteristics.** Ethnic background and socioeconomic status affect success in college. Basically, students from more affluent and educated families are more likely to succeed than those from poorer less educated families (Upcraft, 1989).

4) **Institutional Characteristics.** The site, curriculum, location, and selectivity of the college affect the rate of student success. Generally, large, less selective, public, coeducational universities have a negative affect on students' personal contacts with faculty, the quality of instruction, and opportunity to work with faculty (Astin, 1972).

5) **Institutional Climate.** Student success is enhanced by institutions with campus climates

> that: (a) promotes student-to-student interaction, (b) promotes faculty-student contact, (c) offers on-campus residential living and (d) offers extracurricular activities (Upcraft, 1985).

Other factors that play a role in college success are establishing close friends, participating in orientation programs, belonging to student organizations, being involved in social and cultural activities, using resources, participating in extra curricular activities, and interacting with the faculty (Upcraft, 1989). The literature indicates that the variables for success in college weigh in more favorably for whites than non-white students. That is, on the average, whites have higher academic achievement reflective of better academic preparation (Asian Americans represent an exception to this statistic), higher socioeconomic levels, and greater social-cultural adjustment to the environment. More specifically, the better social adjustment is attributed, in part, to white students having greater interaction with their peers, greater affiliations with campus organizations, more usage of support services (counseling, tutoring, academic advising, etc.), and greater interaction with the faculty on the predominantly white campuses (Taylor, 1987).

Some of the variables will be discussed in more detail later, particularly those regarding personal, cultural characteristics and institutional climate.

Studies of retention show that students leave college due to a combination of complex underlying factors - academic boredom, a sense of irrelevance, unrealistic expectations of college, academic underpreparedness, transition difficulties, uncertainty about a major or career, and incompatibility (Upcraft, 1989).

Research on students nationally identified three major factors related to dropping out of school: 1) academic preparation 2) social-cultural adjustment and 3) financial resources (Taylor, 1987).

The allegation is that America's schools are failing its poor and its minorities. The failure to academically prepare students is explained in the literature from three different perspectives: 1) societal causes that have deep historical roots 2) institutional causes that have been internally accepted by school systems and which have negative and unequitable results for minorities, and 3) individual causes attributed to the learner (Taylor, 1987).

Some feel that societal causes explain the poor academic preparation of minorities and believe, also, that

solutions to the problem lie outside educational institutions and will require changes in society-at-large, - changes in laws, resources, and cultural practices that presently exist in America.

Taylor (1987) asserts that to understand how minorities end up academically behind, one must study the history of education for the African American. He suggests that a book by John Hodge entitled Cultural Basis for Racism and Group Oppression: An Examination of Traditional "Western" Concepts, Values, and Institutional Structures Which Support Racism, Sexism and Elitism presents an analysis of how people wittingly or unwittingly participate in oppressive actions that perpetuate unequal conditions.

Turning to the second perspective regarding academic failure among minorities - institutional causes of inequity that have been adopted by school systems and which result in negative outcomes and unequal conditions for minorities based on racism, class, and related barriers that the school itself has created - it is suggested that schools analyze their practices and pedagogical methods. Taylor (1987) says that what is needed is a better understanding by teachers that they have a great deal of control of "within" school factors. Factors such as tracking,

grouping, and teacher expectations need to be looked at to decide whether changes in school practices and teaching methods are needed in order to improve performance.

Additionally, teacher training is identified in the literature as contributing to unequal conditions in the classroom. Most teachers are considered middle-class or have a middle-class orientation while a large percentage of minority students are poor or lower class. The difference in socioeconomic status between teachers and their students is characterized as a class war. Kenneth Clark (1965) proclaims:

> The clash of culture in the classroom is essentially a class war, a socioeconomic and racial warfare being waged on the battleground of our schools with middle-class teachers provided with a power arsenal of half-truths, prejudices and rationalizations arrayed against hopelessly out-classed, working-class youngsters. This is an uneven balance, particularly since, like most battles, it comes under the guise of righteousness (p. 196).

Specific problems noted regarding teacher training that need to be evaluated include language barriers and cultural gaps that exist between middle-class whites teachers and lower-class African American students.

The literature is unclear as to which is the best pedagogical approach to take to equalize educational

opportunities, but much of the literature supports individualized instruction (Hilgard, 1966).

The third perspective regarding the lack of academic preparation - individual causes attributed to the learner - puts the responsibility of learning on the learner. Those who support this view believe that the reason minority students fail is, in part, due to a lack of motivation either on the part of the individuals, their families, or their communities (Bloom, 1971).

Whether minority failure is due to societal factors, schools, or individual motivation, Taylor (1987) references Evelyn Francher as saying that if the problem of academic deficiencies is to be addressed differently, educators must not assume that because of the economic status of minority students, they are lazy, do not want to learn or can't learn. In brief, educators must not come to the classroom with lower expectation resulting from their own personal prejudices.

Since most of the blame for minority student's academic unpreparedness fall on the American educational system and the claim is made that the schools are failing to meet the needs of the special groups, there is high probability that minority students will continue to enroll

in colleges unprepared. Hence, institutions of higher learning must respond in ways that will give students a reasonable chance to succeed.

Most campuses respond by establishing remedial/developmental programs, tutorial labs, specialized courses, learning centers, and a variety of academic activities are tried. However, many educators feel that it is not the responsibility of institutions of higher eduction to provide remedial education. They believe that if students don't "measure up", they shouldn't be there. This view ignores reasons why remedial education is needed. Taylor (1987) says that to deny minority students additional help once they reach college is to punish them twice, to limit their life choices, and to remove any responsibility from the institutions that prepared them. Taylor believes that society eventually pays for its poorly educated through higher welfare costs, the criminal justice system, unemployment payments and different social welfare programs. Taylor contends that it is more logical to intervene early - preferably as early as elementary and middle school. Colleges and universities can not continue to dismiss the problem, for it is a problem to which they directly or indirectly contributed.

Looking at sociocultural adjustment as another factor related to college retention, research shows that the social environment of the campus affects the academic performances of students (Fleming, 1984).

The literature shows that a basic difficulty faced by minority students is integrating into the system. Bressler (1967) asserts that students of color must choose among several options: assimilation, cultural pluralism or separatism. As previously mentioned, research shows that those students who are able to make a better social adjustment to the collegiate environment are those who are most likely to continue and graduate.

In a study of student attrition conducted by Vincent Tinto (1975), using a multivariate model, it was determined that students' continuation in college was a product of their interaction with college academics and social systems. It was found that the better integrated into these systems the students were, the more successfully the students were in completing their college programs and earning their degrees.

The critical variables in Tinto's model are as follows:

1) Variables pertaining to students' family background (i.e. father's occupation, sibling's occupation, mother's education and

> family composition) (2) variables related to high school experiences (i.e. percentage of minorities in high school and high school grade point average (3) variables pertaining to social interaction (i.e. campus race relations, relations with professors and involvement with support networks) (4) variables which pertained to students attitudes about self, race and achievement, and (5) African American students' academic success-related outcome (i.e. social involvement, academic performance and occupational aspirations.

Tinto's model proposes that African American students' college adjustment, academic performance and occupational aspirations are affected directly or indirectly by these five sets of variables. The model was tested using data from the National Study of Black College Students - a 1981 cross-sectional study of 1,050 African American undergraduate, graduate and professional students attending the University of Michigan - Ann Arbor, University of North Carolina - Chapel Hill, University of California - Los Angeles, Memphis State University, and University of New York -Stonybrook. The schools represented regional diversity and diversity in the proportion of African American student enrollment. The students were given a 15-page questionnaire requesting information about their family background, attitudes, campus experiences,

aspirations, academic performance level, and perceptions of the university (Allen, 1989).

To test Tinto's model, Allen examined patterns in the distribution of individual variables. The results show interrelations between institutional contexts, interpersonal relationships (i.e. campus experiences), and individual views of reality (Allen, 1988). In brief, African Americans' success or failure was seen as resulting from the effects of student characteristics (intelligence, motivation, etc.), campus relationships, and attitudes.

Additionally, a profile of the sample of African American students who were surveyed reflects that sixty-five percent of the respondents were female. A majority of the respondents (44%) attended universities in the South, 34% attended schools in the North, and the remaining 22% were from the West.

Almost half of those surveyed (45%) believed that they were a very little or no part of the general campus life. The median grade point average was 2.58 on a 4 -point scale. Their median high school grade point average was 3.4. Seventy percent planned to pursue advanced degrees beyond the bachelor's level. Many of the students expected

to enter fields such as engineering, law, medicine and corporate business.

Compared to the majority of African Americans, the sample students were economically advanced. Over 70% of their parents graduated from high school; more than 25% of their parents had college degrees. Median annual family income was $20,000; 25% of the students reported incomes below $12,000 and 14% reported income of about $50,000. Approximately half of the students attended schools with over 40% African American enrollment.

Even though the profile describes students who appear destined for success (those with higher socioeconomic status, high motivation, and superior high school records), it is estimated that approximately half of these students will leave college before graduation. Allen contends that their social estrangement from campus life is the only exception to a mostly positive pattern (Allen, 1988). In fact, social adjustment was highest for students who claimed better relations with faculty, higher participation in African American student organization activities, and had favorable opinions about support services and race relations.

Allen also found that students from northern universities, higher socioeconomic status, and those who were more socially involved had significantly higher aspirations. Students with better grades tended to have closer relations with faculty, better high school grade point averages, higher socioeconomic status, be from large high schools and be in western universities. Students in southern universities had lower self-confidence, achievement drive and socioeconomic status. Ironically, students in the South reported more favorable race relations.

Allen's findings explain the variance in African American students' social involvement, academic achievement and occupational aspirations. He reports that students who are regular participants in African American student organization activities, who have good relations with faculty, have positive assessments of their campus support services and are involved in social activities believe that they have been better integrated into the college environment and are basically more satisfied with college life.

Social involvement is not strongly related to student views of campus race relations, the racial composition of

high school and socioeconomic status. Thus, Allen rejects the implied "acculturation hypothesis". Instead, he offers an "interpersonal accomplishment" hypothesis, contending that African American students who have good interpersonal skills are more involved with campus life. The assertion is that they manage to create and maintain favorable social relationships with African Americans and whites and with faculty and students on the campus. These same students have higher grades and have a better "fit" in the collegiate environment.

The issue of "fit" in the college environment obviously applies to all races, not just African Americans, Hispanics and other minorities. It is logical to deduce that those who better "fit" into an environment are those who will be happier, more productive and will, therefore, continue in that setting until they have successfully completed their goals. Yet, the question arises as to what can be or needs to be done to allow non-white students to have a better "fit" in predominantly white colleges and universities. Another question and perhaps more important is whether the students need to fit the environment or whether the environment should change to better "fit" the

students. This latter question will be addressed later after examining another attrition factor.

The literature cites financial resources as the third major reason for the high attrition rate for minorities, particularly African American students. Indeed, the lull in the American economy has affected almost every aspect of life for most citizens. As mentioned previously, cuts in federal spending began in the early 1980's and have continued, thus limiting low-income students' access to and continuation in institutions of higher education.

A study, The Effect of Tuition and Financial Aid in Access and Choice in Post Secondary Education (1978), by William Hyde reports that enrollment rates and tuition levels are related. Hyde concludes that a tuition decrease of one hundred dollars would result in an enrollment increase of three percent.

Further, Hyde's study reveals that many students could not attend college without financial aid, and that grants raise enrollment rates more so than work-study programs or loans. One possible explanation for this might be that the idea of working and trying to study and the idea of indebtedness may serve as deterrents to some minorities, especially those who may be marginal students-

academically, emotionally and/or socially deficient to begin with.

Taylor (1987) claims that there is a need for financial aid practices that take into account the great need that some students enter college with. Taylor asserts that the combination of loan and grant amounts that the students received deserves serious consideration because a pattern is developing nationally in which minority students are graduating with nearly twice the loan debt of white students. His sentiments regarding financial aid is best depicted in his own words, "To enter and leave college at a disadvantage is an unfair burden for minority students to bear" (Taylor, 1978 p. 63).

Orfield (1988) contends that tuition and financial aid policy decisions of the 1980's made the situation for minority families (whose average income is far lower than the majority population's) much worse. Nationally, college tuition rose faster than the cost of living in the 1980's. The income of African American families remained far below the median, and the income of Hispanic families has fallen substantially.

One astonishing aspect in Orfield's study shows a low number of community college students (a majority of whom

are urban minorities) who receive financial aid. He reports that campus surveys reveal that 85% receive no financial aid even though many of the students are poor and receive welfare. Orfield reports that the state financial aid system is directed toward the four-year private and public colleges - overlooking the fact that the two-year institutions are the only colleges that most non-white students attend in the state of California.

In essence, research shows that college and university financial aid programs are failing to meet the needs of minority students. Funding for programs have been cut: funds that are available are more frequently disbursed to four-year institutions at the exclusion of community colleges which serve a greater minority enrollment. Thus, disadvantaged groups who need aid to attend college are finding such aid unavailable or severely limited.

In addition to the previously mentioned variables that affect college success, the literature indicates that several other factors have adversely affected minority students on predominantly white campuses. These factors are addressed in the following sections.

RACISM

America is a healthier country now than it once was, but it is far from being cured of the illness of racism. This fact is evidenced by recent resurgence of Ku Klux Klan activities in various parts of the United States. Leslie W. Dunbar in The State of Black America (1980, p. 256) states, " I think the recent resurgence of Klan and like activities, and of their disorganized, almost experimental manifestations, reflect perhaps not necessarily an enlarged racist spirit but at least a widespread relaxing of the social discipline learned during the civil rights movement: `respectable' people feel more at ease today letting their prejudice slip out, and Klan-sorts detect that."

The fact that racism is alive and well in America is further evidenced by numerous news reports regarding racial conflicts on various college campuses. For example, The University of Texas - Austin was recently in the public eye due to racial slurs and racially derogatory actions on the part of the members of two different fraternities- the Delta Tau Delta fraternity who smashed a car painted with the epithet, "die nigger coon," and Phi Gamma Delta (Figis) who were reported to have printed T-shirts with a Sambo caricature as the head on a picture of Michael Jordan, a

renown African American National Basketball Association player (Moss, May 12, 1990).

In response to such blatant racist acts, African Americans, other minority, and white students publicly demonstrated and protested, calling for the University administration to redress the fraternities and to develop a multicultural curriculum to sensitize faculty and students to the issues of culture and race.

Black Student Alliance members met with the president of the University of Texas - Austin, Dr. William H. Cunningham, whereupon they presented their multicultural plan, PRIDE, (Proposed Reforms to Institute Diversity in Education). The plan called for a culturally diversified campus, including recruiting more African American professors and requiring at least one African American studies class for all undergraduate students.

President Cunningham delineated several parts of a recent report made by his Ad Hoc Committee on Racial Harassment. He claimed that the University was moving quickly to implement the committee recommendations - such as expanding the multicultural components of the curriculum to embrace African American and Hispanic cultures, hiring a race relations counselor to work with students who have

complaints of racial harassment, and establishing seminars to educate faculty and staff on issues of racial awareness and multiple culturalism (Cunningham, April 27, 1990).

Needless to say, the University of Texas - Austin does not have a monopoly on racism. In the last several years, the media has reported numerous racial incidents on college and university campuses throughout the country.

In this report, racism is defined as a mixed form of discrimination and prejudice directed at ethnic groups that are racially different from the majority. Traditionally, racism referred to the conscious or unconscious belief that members of racial groups other than one's own were innately inferior (Gollnick and Chinn, 1983).

Gollnick and Chinn (1983, p. 56) assert, "The most crucial factor in understanding racism is that the majority group has differential power over the minority group. This power has been used to prevent non-whites from securing the prestige, power, and privilege held by whites. Racism is also practiced by whites and their institutions to maintain a dominant-subordinate relationship with non-white minorities." Further, racism encompasses much more than prejudicial attitudes that are rigid and emotional and/or prejudgments or misjudgments of a racial group. David T.

Wellman wrote (1977, p.42), "Racism is more effectively analyzed as a strategy for the maintenance of privilege than as prejudice...When racism is analyzed in this way, the demands and challenges that black people impose on the American racial order figure prominently. White racism is often a response to and a reflection of the issues generated by black people."

Basically, Wellman analyzes racism as a defense of a privilege (whites endeavoring to protect their privileged status in society). He states that racist attitudes persist because racial inequality persists. Wellman (1977, p.41) says, "If we extend the definition of racism beyond prejudice to include sentiments that in their consequences, if not in their intent, support the racial status quo, racist beliefs will not be found predominantly among America's lower classes. Rather they will be found among all Americans." An example of Wellman's theory can be found in institutions of higher education where professors who oppose open enrollment programs or African American studies departments contend they are concerned that these programs will lower academic standards and contend that selective recruitment of African American faculty will violate academic norms. Wellman says that

whether the demands and responses are legitimate or illegitimate is not the issue. The issue is whether implementation of African American demands would decrease the unequal relationship between African Americans and whites. If the consequence of whites acceding to African American demands reduces the African American - White inequality, and if whites choose to oppose it, then regardless of the principle invoked, that opposition perpetuates the status quo, and this amounts to racism (Wellman, 1983).

Hence, when predominantly white institutions of higher eduction are asked to make changes that will reduce the inequities between their minority students and their white students, and if these institutions refuse to do so, these institutions, according to Wellman, are practicing racism.

Additionally, racism manifests itself in the belief systems of many whites. For instance, many whites no longer believe that African Americans are genetically inferior; yet they hold to another ideology. It is that of the dominant Euro-American ideology of free will: "Anyone can better himself if he is not too lazy to make the effort." This ideology, however, does not acknowledge the impact of the oppressive racial, social, and economic

conditions experienced by minorities. It places the responsibility of the marginal conditions of oppressed people on the minority groups themselves- a phenomenon called blaming the victim.

Another belief system with Darwinian implications is that minorities must really be inferior to whites, or they would be doing as well as whites. Many whites feel that if minorities just work hard, they would achieve and receive the same benefits as earlier European immigrants who came to America and "pulled themselves up by their bootstrings." These whites reject the existence of external factors and impingements that make it more difficult for people of color. They ignore the fact that most minority groups have adopted the cultural values and standards of the majority population and are still not accepted as equals. Many whites fail to realize that the opportunities for African Americans to obtain institutional strongholds (i.e. education) with which to successfully compete with whites have been restricted throughout their history (Gollnick and Chinn, 1983).

Minorities contend that their progress has been impeded because of racism which permeates predominantly white colleges and universities. As victims of racism and

prejudice, African Americans, Hispanics and other minorities are speaking out and demanding that changes be made, particularly in educational institutions.

It seems that whites are unwilling to make changes. A 1978 survey conducted by the New York Times and CBS focused on the recent racial attitude of whites: "Although whites have better attitudes about race relations and improved understanding, they lack the will to take the bitter medicine that the remedies for racism require." (Sleeter and Grant, 1988, p. 5). Sleeter and Grant elaborate on this quote by explaining how whites have conceded to endorse certain principles relative to racial equality (i.e. fair housing laws have been passed), but are often reluctant to enforce these principles (i.e. segregated neighborhoods still exist in many parts of the country).

Most assuredly, racism has played and continues to play a major role in the progress of African Americans and other minorities; especially in education. Again as Wellman (1977) says when institutions refuse to acquiesce to the requests of minority students to implement programs and activities (reforms) that will reduce the "privileged status" of some and promote equal status for all, these

institutions are practicing racism, and they are refusing to take the bitter medicine that remedies racism alluded to by Sleeter and Grant (1988).

SOCIOECONOMIC ISSUES

Research reveals another aspect of white privilege. The data show that whites make up the majority of the highest socioeconomic class, and African Americans and other minorities are in the lower ranks. In this case minorities of color face double discrimination (that against their race and economic status). With higher socioeconomic status, comes greater political and policy-making power for members of the majority population. In view of this fact, it is easy to see how those in policy-making positions in colleges and universities may make decisions without serious attention or sensitivity to the social class diversity of their enrollments. A lack of serious attention to the socioeconomic diversity reveals power differentials between social classes. The powerful determine admissions policies, financial aid, curriculum, and participation in certain activities (i.e. membership in social fraternities and sororities, residence in on-campus housing, etc.). This social class power to structure the university affects minorities' (who are the powerless

classes) overall level of achievement, success and/or satisfaction. Stated more succinctly, socioeconomic factors may cause many minorities not to attend college, leave college before graduation, and/or not participate in college activities as fully as they might due to financial and social restraints.

As stated earlier, students from more affluent families are more likely to succeed than those from poorer families (Astin, 1972). This holds true for minority students as well. Those from middle or upper-middle class families have parents who are more highly educated and serve as mentors, motivators, advisors, and supporters. On the other hand, those minority students from the lower socioeconomic classes and who may be the first in the family history to attend college may not have ready access to someone who can facilitate their educational experience. Subsequently, these students may be more likely to encounter frustrations as they endeavor to meet the challenges of collegiate life. These frustrations often become overwhelming and, thus, contribute to the attrition rate of minority students.

COUNSELOR'S ROLE

In the early 1960's, The American Personnel Guidance Association (APGA) appointed a commission to study the role and function of school counselors. The commission recommended that counselors should provide individual and group counseling to students, as well as consultation to parents and teachers. It was apparent that the commission envisioned the counselor as one who would provide services to maximize student potential by emphasizing personal growth, self-determination, and self-responsibility (Myrick, 1987).

Hence, with the APGA Commission's recommendations in hand, school counselors set out working with students - students who, for the most part, were racially and socioeconomically similar to themselves. However , with the desegregation of schools in the mid-1960's, there was an influx of minority students in formerly all-white schools, and counselors were faced with the responsibility of working along with those "different" students.

During the late 1960's and the early 1970's, federal legislation enabling counseling services to be established in a variety of settings proliferated. Much of the legislation was aimed at segments of the population

commonly referred to as the culturally deprived or culturally unassimilated. Central to these programs was the employment of counselors whose goals were (1) to increase the accuracy of the individual's self percepts; (2) to increase the accuracy of the individual's environmental perceptions; (3) to integrate the individuals self percepts with environmental realities and perceptions; (4) to present relevant information; and to improve the individual's ability to make plans and execute them (Shertzer and Stone, 1971).

Shertzer and Stone (1971) reference an article written by Edward Gross wherein he points out that the federal governments justification for counseling programs to service the disadvantaged were based upon economic, humanitarian and educational grounds. Counselors employed by the federal government to work with the "disadvantaged" went into their jobs with advanced knowledge of the kind of clientele with whom they would be working and with delineated goals. Such was not the case with school counselors who were not accustomed to working with minority students and did not know about their specific needs and cultures.

Therefore, in the 1960's and 70's school counselors often worked with minority students from a framework based on their prejudices, biases and perceptions - from a framework that did not accommodate and allow for cultural differences between the students and the counselor.

As reported in Texas Association for Counseling and Development (1988), counseling is a middle class activity that displays many characteristics and values different from minority groups values.

As a result, counselors working with minorities in the decades of the 60's and 70's often directed them toward non-professional, blue-collar and/or low-skill occupations, using standardized test scores almost exclusively neglecting the minority students personal motivation, interests, and aspirations. Minorities were discouraged from pursing professional, technical or high-skill occupations.

Andrew Helwig and Joe Vidales (TACD Journal, 1988) cite researchers who suggest that minority youth lag behind their white counterparts in career development and knowledge of occupational information. Additionally, they cite research which shows that white 8th, 10th and 12th graders scored higher than African Americans on career

development measures and were also more accurate than African Americans in self-estimating their abilities. Helwig and Vidales suggest that counselors need to reexamine and question the adequacy of predominant vocational theories in describing and predicting vocational development and occupational decision making in minority students. The assertion is that white counselors and minority counselors view factors related to career development and job seeking quite differently. For example, in a statewide needs assessment of 1,121 counselors working in various settings, it was discovered that minority more than white counselors believed it was more important for their students to: know how to use the Dictionary of Occupational Titles and Occupation Outlook Handbook; have knowledge about: illegal interviewing questions, different types of resumes, and regional history of employment changes and attitudes. In brief, the investigation revealed that minority counselors place more stress on a variety of career decision making and job seeking skills and knowledge for their clients than do white counselors. Minority counselors seem more interested in empowering their minority students in their quest to be competitive in the labor market (TACD Journal, 1988).

The implication is that minority counselors are more aware of and more sensitive to the needs of minority students in the area of career development and, thus, able and willing to employ directive, confrontive and supportive counselor behaviors as well as give information to minority students who have not been apprised of and exposed to job opportunities that whites have been exposed to.

It is not enough for counselors to be sensitive to the needs of minorities in the area of career development, but also to the culture, language and customs of their counselees, and they must present educational and occupational information to them in ways that relate to their daily experiences in mainstream America. The techniques are the same as those used for middle and upper class youth (i.e. assemblies, printed information, career conferences, field visits). The difference is in content: the language, customs, and illustrations must relate to the world the minority student knows. The counselors must have some understanding of the differences in value systems and the differences in the upbringing between them and their counselees (Amos and Grambs, 1968).

What is needed are counselors who can work cross-culturally. There should be counselors who have been

trained in and are aware of the problems inherent in a racially and ethnically mixed society in which social economic and educational disparities exist. They must be cognizant of the many factors that contribute to the difficulties that low socioeconomic students (mostly minorities) have in attending, adjusting, and succeeding in educational institutions, most especially in institutions of higher learning. This recognition of the problems of minority should in turn prompt counselors to provide support and early intervention to alleviate these problems.

One program designed to confront these problems is that of James Cunningham and Romeria Tidwell (1990) who present a cognitive-development counseling model that was designed to promote high school seniors' readiness for college through a process called psychological education. The objective of "psychological education" is to give students information taken from research in behavioral science that is relevant to helping them deal with their own personal problems. The program is aimed at the student's psychological and social development - development which the literature shows significantly affects college success.

The counseling model presented by Cunningham and Tidwell is described as preventative, proactive counseling intervention. It is designed to prepare young people from low-socioeconomic backgrounds to cope with the pressures of college before they get there. The intervention emphasizes cultural issues and specific social environments which the students are likely to encounter. The model includes a cognitive-developmental curriculum which consists of didactic, experimental and reflective activities aimed at promoting the psychological development of minority students (Chickering, 1969).

Whether counselors adopt the cognitive-development model offered by Cunningham and Tidwell or not, they will better assist college-bound students if they apprise them of the transition experienced by all college students and especially prepare them, by whatever means possible to meet the challenges they will face in college as members of minority groups.

Counselors must help in college adjustment by promoting students' personal development. They must aid in the students' academic development by helping them select courses that are consistent with their abilities and interests. Still further, counselors must assist in

students' career development by helping them to explore and clarify career interests, abilities, and life values (Upcraft, 1989). All of these steps must be taken by counselors who are trained in cross-cultural counseling so that counseling services can be beneficial to all students and not a select few.

CHAPTER THREE

RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION PROGRAMS

According to E.L. Boyer (1983) higher education is in the midst of self-evaluation, and American policy makers have concluded that much reform is needed if institutions of higher learning are to effectively educate their diverse enrollments. Indeed, colleges and universities should look more closely at themselves, especially at their racial and ethnic compositions. Such scrutiny should persuade them that the large percentages of African Americans, Hispanics, Asians, and other minority students can not be ignored.

Moreover, these institutions of higher education can not dismiss data which show that certain populations not only have the problems peculiar to all college students (transition difficulties, uncertainty about a major, unrealistic expectations and so forth) but also have certain needs and problems peculiar specifically to them as members of a disenfranchised group (academic under-preparedness, feelings of alienation, and so on).

Many colleges and universities will acknowledge that there are students roaming their corridors who are academically unprepared. The public outburst that "Johnnie

can't read" has been heard by institutions of higher learning, and they have acknowledged that a disproportionate number of "Johnnies" are African Americans and Hispanics.

As mentioned earlier, many colleges respond to the "Johnnie can't read" outcry by establishing remedial programs, tutorial labs, learning centers, et cetera. However, research indicates that much more than attention to academic needs is necessary if minorities are to experience college success.

Obviously, educational deficiencies must be addressed. Even when academics is not the problem, the literature shows that overall success and satisfaction for the African American student is often minuscule when compared to that of white students due to other factors - poor social adjustment, feelings of alienation and so forth.

Hence, progressive colleges and universities are making concerted efforts to address the needs of all students and are purposefully directing attention to "special populations." Institutions are investigating ways to retain and provide positive experiences for African American, Hispanic, Asian American, Native American, and foreign students.

The literature reveals numerous recruitment and retention strategies, programs and plans. Naturally, some plans have been more effective than others. One retention model described by Charles Taylor (1987) seems fairly comprehensive and could serve as a guide for colleges and universities interested in improving their retention rates. Taylor's model stresses that considerable energy must be expended in several areas: (1) **Pre-Collegiate** - Focus must be put on ways to improve academic skills, help students better access and utilize support services and ways to improve students' self-concept and integrate them into the mainstream of cultural and academic life during their childhood, adolescence and high school years. (2) **Recruitment and Admission** - Emphasis must be given to locating minority recruits and enhancing recruitment efforts. (3) **Matriculation** - Taylor says that an effective matriculation program ensures that each newly admitted student receive proper advising which will enable the student to enroll in appropriate classes. Matriculation services should include monitoring, placements, financial aid and housing follow-ups. These follow-ups will add more force to the overall retention efforts. (4) **Retention** - The focus is on high attrition rates among minorities, and

Taylor stresses that institutions have an obligation to produce services to reduce the attrition rate. (5) **Graduation** - Taylor says that colleges must recruit with the goal of graduating minority students. The implication here is that recruitment efforts in the past were designed to simply meet affirmative action numerical enrollment goals. Additionally, he points out that a greater number of minorities major in the humanities and education and should be encouraged to venture into more scientific fields. (6) **Post Graduation** - Taylor cites statistics which show the decrease in African Americans and Hispanics in graduate and professional school. He stresses that graduate schools need to do a better job of outreach to minority undergraduate students. (7) **Alumni** - Taylor asserts that minority alumni are a valuable asset to recruitment and retention since they serve as proof to other potential minority students that graduation is a possible accomplishment for them.

For each facet of his retention model, Taylor delineates specific ways to improve retention. Taylor stresses that minority student retention must be viewed as a total college effort which involves all aspects of the institution. He believes that retention services should

include orientation, highly structured freshman year activities, academic advising, counseling, learning resources, and faculty involvement.

Many colleges and universities have designed retention programs incorporating some, if not all, of the facets of Taylor's model, making modifications and adjustments which best accommodate their individual campuses. Those programs that address the social and emotional needs of minority students are those most likely to be effective in improving retention and providing a more rewarding collegiate experience for African Americans and other minorities. Further, those programs that have minority faculty members serving as advisors and/or mentors to the minority students are more apt to be effective because minority students are more likely to establish relations with those with whom they can identify or with those who may be more cognizant of and sensitive to their needs and concerns.

A recent interview with Dr. Wanda Nelson, Assistant Dean Of Students of University of Texas - Austin, revealed that the University has many retention efforts in place throughout the different schools and colleges, in addition to those under the auspices of Retention Services. Dr.

Nelson disclosed that the University of Texas directs 138 different programs aimed at effective transition and adjustment to college. Many of the programs are particularly geared toward improving retention of minority students.

A listing of the programs specifically in Dr. Nelson's area and brief descriptions of the various programs are on pages 67-75. Moreover, Dr. Nelson offered data from the office of the Vice President for Student Affairs in the form of a comprehensive chart entitled Minority Recruitment and Retention (1989). The chart outlines the 138 programs sponsored by the University. It lists the contact person, program name, program purpose, type of program, the target group, ethnic focus, time of contact, place of contact, funding source, funding amount, and descriptive comments about each program (The chart reflects activity from September 1, 1987 - August 3, 1988). Unfortunately, the chart is the size of a city map which prohibits its inclusion in this report. The fact is, however, that the chart's contents reveal that the University of Texas - Austin has given substantial attention to the issue of minority recruitment and retention.

Many of the programs described in materials Dr. Nelson shared are similar to those suggested by Taylor (1987).

OPPORTUNITIES / INTERVENTIONS FOR FRESHMEN

Office of the Dean of Students

Prior to the Beginning of Classes

***CASA Program** (Computer-Assisted Self Assessment) (program which serves as an automated, personalized introduction to UT and which is available in many Texas high schools)

***Summer Orientation Invitation** (newly-admitted students receive information on summer orientation beginning in mid-March)

***Summer Orientation Program** (seven three-day programs offered during June and July to orient new students to campus and provide individualized academic advising)

***Summer Orientation Parent's Program** (a parents' program is scheduled on the first afternoon of every summer orientation session to ease parents' anxieties and provide them information on academic life and student services)

***Summer Orientation, Wing Advisor Letter** (after each orientation session, wing advisors send a personalized letter to each of the orientees on the wings to encourage

them to participate in the Freshman Services program in the fall)

*Fall New Student Guide (information on the Fall Orientation Program, along with details about credit by examination and centralized registration is mailed late in July to all newly-admitted students who did not attend the Summer Orientation Program)

*Fall Orientation Program (a series of programs designed to orient new students to the campus is offered in conjunction with centralized registration)

*Start Fresh Program (a series of special programs that are held during centralized registration week to make new students feel welcome at UT)

Additional Opportunities/Interventions for Minority Students:

*Minority Parents' Newsletter (mailed to parents of newly-admitted minority students in early April, this newsletter features primarily information on student services)

*Preview Program Information (during April, newly-admitted students receive information on the Preview Program, a program held in conjunction with the second summer term and designed to help a select number of

minority students get off to a good start at UT through supplemental instruction and enrichment programming)

*Minority Voices (a publication mailed to newly-admitted minority students in early May containing advice from upperclass students on making the transition to UT successfully)

*Letter from Orientation Advisors Serving on the "African American and Mexican American Experience at UT" Program Committee (mailed in conjunction with Minority Voices to newly-admitted minority students encouraging them to attend Summer Orientation)

*Summer Visitation Program (during June and July, upperclass minority students who are going home for the summer contact newly-admitted minority students from their hometowns)

*Summer Orientation "African American and Mexican American Experience at UT" Program (this program is offered during each summer orientation sessions and informs incoming African American students and Mexican American students about the campus resources and programs available to them as minority students)

***Welcome Program Information Mailing** (early in July, newly-admitted minority students are sent an information packet about the Welcome Program for African American and Mexican American Students)

***Preview Program** (a select number of newly-admitted minority students participate in a special program during the second summer term designed to help get them off to a good start at UT through supplemental instruction and enrichment programming)

***Fall Orientation "African American and Mexican American Experience at UT" Program** (a program held during the "Fall Orientation Program" to inform African American and Mexican American students about the campus resources and programs available to them as minority students)

***Welcome Program Jump Start and Matching Sessions** (newly-admitted minority students are matched with upperclass minority students and participate together in these special programs held in late August and early September)

First Semester

***F.I.R.S.T. (Freshman Issues and Resources Services Team) Programs** (a series of programs sponsored throughout the

semester that address the ongoing needs of freshmen students such as programs dealing with academic and library skills, coping with roommate problems, finals week survival, and going home again)

***UT 101** (a non-credit course specifically designed for first semester freshmen)

***Freshman Students' Association** (a student organization for freshmen only)

***New Student Phone-a-thon** (during late September and early October, telephone calls are made by peer advisors to all new students welcoming them to campus)

***FIRST Flash** (a newsletter is mailed to all new freshmen providing them with pertinent information about freshmen activities, University procedures, and Dean of Students Office programs and services)

***Parents' Newsletter** (a newsletter is mailed to all parents of newly-enrolled students informing them about student services and academic procedures)

***Mid-semester Preadvising** (orientation advisors help new students prepare to see their faculty advisor prior to early registration for the spring)

Additional Opportunities/Interventions for Minority Students:

***(RSSP) Retention Services Support Program** (a two-semester program for minority freshmen to assist with their adjustment to The University and their academic survival through the first academic year; weekly small group meetings, contacts with peer advisors, and individual meetings with DOS staff are required)

***Welcome Program Special Programs** (during the fall semester, special programs such as "Ensuring Your Success at UT," "Up Close and Personal" and a sexuality workshop are held for participants in the Welcome Program for African American and Mexican American students)

***MAPS (Mapping a Plan for Success) Program** (around mid-semester, peer advisors contact students who are having academic difficulties to help them find appropriate assistance)

***Monday Night Study Program** (every Monday night, facilitators are available to assist students with their course work)

***Minority Leadership Conference** (a one-day conference for African American and Mexican American student leaders)

***Culture Room Programs** (throughout the semester, programs are offered to educate the University community regarding African American and Mexican American cultures and to encourage minority students to take pride in their cultural heritages)

***Messages** (a newsletter is mailed each semester to all minority students)

***Parents' Weekend Activities** (special programs are held for parents of minority students in conjunction with other Parents' Weekend activities)

***Brown Bag Lunches** (separate brown bag lunches for African American and Mexican American students are held biweekly to encourage a dialogue among faculty, staff community representatives, and students)

Second Semester

***F.I.R.S.T. Programs** (same as first semester)

***Freshman Students' Association** (same as first semester)

***Mid-semester Preadvising** (same as first semester)

***Alpha Lambda Delta and Phi Eta Sigma** (honor societies for freshmen achieving at least a 3.5 grade point average during their first semester at UT)

Additional Opportunities/Intervention for Minority Students:

***Mentor Program** (interested minority students are matched with a faculty mentor who assists them throughout the school year)

***Culture Room Programs** (same as first semester)

***MAPS Program** (same as first semester)

***Monday Night Study Program** (same as first semester)

***Brown Bag Lunches** (same as first semester)

*****Messages (same as first semester)

***Minority Leadership Class** (minority students may sign up for this one-hour credit-bearing class designed to help them improve their leadership skills)

*****"Success '89" (a conference is cosponsored each spring by the Dean of Students Office and the Mexican American Student Leadership Council to encourage students to examine issues affecting the Mexican American community)

***Heman Sweatt Excellence Awards** (in conjunction with Blackfest, awards are presented to outstanding African American faculty and students)

***Minority Students Awards Reception** (at the end of the academic year, a reception honoring all minority

students with a 3.0 grade point average or above is held)

Although Taylor's model for recruitment and retention and those services offered at the University of Texas - Austin were the only ones, herein reported, the literature is replete with other similar programs and services.

A critique of the effects of the retention programs is less than satisfactory. The University of Texas - Austin and other predominantly white colleges and universities continue to have high attrition rates for minorities, especially African Americans. The programs have not produced the desired results; they are not producing large numbers of minority graduates; in fact, they are losing large numbers of African Americans.

Hence, the question is posed again: "How can minority students experience greater success at predominantly white colleges and universities?" The answer to this question might finally lie in a relatively new concept being advocated by those who are acutely aware of and sensitive to the multiplicity of races and cultures that constitute the student body of most institutions of higher education - a concept known as multiculturalism.

CHAPTER FOUR

MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION AND CULTURAL PLURALISM

The literature shows that many minorities on predominantly white college campuses experience frustration, dissatisfaction and ultimately failure because they never achieve the proper "fit" that results in their continuation until they can earn their degrees. Alienation is the one word frequently used by minority students to characterize their feelings regarding life on predominantly white college campuses. David Claerbaut (1978) states that the literature is replete with evidence of black alienation at large, public universities- evidence showing that African American students do not feel that they "fit" properly in these white environments.

A study of eighty-three traditionally white institutions conducted by John Centra (1970) revealed that there is a dual environment on many campuses with minimal African American involvement in on-campus activities. Considering that the institutions are controlled by whites, it is easy to suspect that lack of involvement by African American students is due to a feeling of alienation. This alienation frequently leads to minority students attrition

from institutions where they do not "fit" and from institutions that do not "fit" them.

Luis Nieves (1978) recognizes that minorities on predominantly white campuses want to acquire the skills college offers but also want to retain their personal life that is fostered by their race or ethnicity. He stresses that colleges and universities have failed to allow minority students to share their cultures and values with the college community and to communicate that being different is an asset, not a liability.

Those who agree with Nieves advocate multiculturalism and cultural pluralism as a means of retaining minority students and enhancing their educational experiences at predominantly white campuses. They agree that multicultural education as described in Making Choices for Multicultural Education (Sleeter and Grant, 1988) should have five distinct goals: (1) promote the strength and value of cultural diversity, (2) promote human rights and respect for those who are different from oneself, (3) promote alternative life choices for all people, (4) promote social justice and equal opportunity for all people, and (5) promote equity in the distribution of power among groups. In brief, multicultural education should be

education policies and practices that recognize, accept, and affirm human differences and similarities related to gender, race, handicap, and class (Sleeter and Grant, 1988).

Advocates of multicultural education often compare U.S. society to a tossed salad or a patchwork quilt. Both metaphors depict an array of materials and objects of various sizes, shapes, and colors. Each is independent of the others, and each is unique, and they therefore form a collective total that is distinguished by its difference and diversity. Thus, cultural pluralism includes maintenance of diversity, respect for differences, and the right to participate actively in all aspects of society without having to give up one's unique identity (Sleeter and Grant, 1988).

Minority students throughout the United States are beginning to demand that their schools provide multicultural education and cultural pluralism. To these students multicultural education will require reforms in the total educational process. That is, curriculum, instruction, evaluation, staffing, and extracurricular activities should be changed so that they represent diverse perspectives, experiences and contributions. For example,

if Euro-centric poetry is being taught, poetry written by African Americans, Hispanics, Native Americans and other cultural groups should be presented. This will not only teach students that groups other than white men/women have written poetry; it will also enrich the concept of poetry by enabling the students to examine various poetic styles.

Additionally, advocates of multicultural education recommend that the teacher, in presenting contributions and perspectives, depict each cultural group as the group would depict itself and do so by showing an active and dynamic culture. This requires that the teacher learn about the various groups and become sensitive to aspects of each group's culture. For example, a teacher wishing to include Native American culture might choose Sacajawea as a heroine to teach about, but for the Native American perspective, Sequoya would be a preferable historic figure. Sacajawea served white interests in leading Lewis and Clark west, while Sequoya served the interests of the Cherokee by developing an alphabet for encoding the Cherokee language (Sleeter and Grant, 1988).

In brief, multicultural education should present diverse cultural histories, viewpoints, and contributions, and the presentations should be positive, devoid of racial

stereotypes and negative bias against any group. Thus, students gain knowledge of and respect for all cultures.

The cry for multiculturalism at the University of Texas - Austin has grown louder in view of the recent racial tension on the campus. Specifically, one group - the Black Faculty Caucus - has set forth a proposal for multiculturalism at U.T. The proposal presented by the faculty caucus calls for several reforms:

> (1) A "truly multicultural" University of Texas at Austin with minority group representation at all levels of the University in proportion to their presence in the general population in the state of Texas. This requires that numerous steps be taken:
>
> > (a) A unified program of recruitment and retention of minority students at the undergraduate level that would redouble efforts at recruitment of qualified minority students both within and outside the State; intervention at the high school level or below to assist students, especially those who might otherwise not meet admission standards, in preparation for undergraduate education; expansion of existing scholarship programs for deserving minority

students; unification and expansion of existing retention programs and the establishment of minority student culture and retention centers.

(b) An aggressive program of minority graduate student recruitment.

(c) Expanded efforts to recruit and retain minority faculty.

(d) Creation of a program to recruit and place minority administrators (Proposal, 1990).

Moreover, the Black Faculty Caucus Proposal for Multiculturalism (Proposal, 1990, p. 3) demands a curriculum which: "educates students as to the diversity and unity of world cultures; enables students to appreciate the relative nature of their experiences and world views; and helps students understand, through an examination of issues of race, gender, class, and sexuality, how power is wielded between cultures, how it reflects racial diversity and is organized by contemporary and historical policies." The curriculum proposed by the Faculty Caucus includes:

(a) A reassessment and reformation of the University's curriculum to insure the presence of multiple cultures in all bodies of knowledge.

(b) Traditionally required courses in American history, Texas government, and English 316 be reformed to include materials which promote student understanding of the participation of peoples of minority cultures and races in these areas of knowledge.

(c) Degree and area requirements in which students must take two minority studies courses.

(d) A required graduate student course in each department which investigates the construction of the traditional disciplinary canons, methods and methodologies and issues of discussion in relation to race, class, and gender (Proposal, 1990).

The proposal for multiculturalism at UT, as presented by the Black Faculty Caucus, is offered as a guideline that the University might use to create a campus whose policies and practices will indeed recognize, accept, and affirm human differences and similarities related to gender, race, handicap, and class. The proposal calls for reforms that will help the University better "fit" the needs of its diverse enrollment.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION

Data presented in this report reveal that minority students, especially African American students, enter college with educational deficits resulting from earlier years of schooling. Their grades and test scores are lower, and their occupational goals are more limited than those of white students. Moreover, while in college, minorities experience higher rates of attrition, lower enrollment at prestigious institutions, and under-representation in the science, engineering and professional fields. In addition, they report greater emotional and social stress and less satisfaction with college in general than their white contemporaries. Regrettably, the data provide an unattractive picture of the experiences of minorities in higher education. African Americans surveyed in the National Study referenced by Allen (1988) spoke adamantly about their "fit" into campus life. They cited problems of social adjustment, cultural alienation, and strained interpersonal relations, particularly awkward relationships with their white faculty. Even though the profile that emerges is one of the African American continuing to struggle on his journey for a better life,

the entire blame does not rest upon institutions of higher learning. The American society has to be examined because the colleges and universities are merely microcosms and mirror the problems that exist in the society as a whole.

Yet, institutions of higher learning can not divorce themselves from their share of the responsibility for the dismal state of affairs in higher education for minorities. The institutions must address the situations that have hampered the educational achievement of African Americans and other non-whites. They must develop financial aid programs that will allow increased minority participation in higher education. They must implement or expand special programs designed to address the needs and circumstances of African American students. Colleges and universities must more actively involve their faculty, especially minority faculty in the recruitment and retention of minority students. Finally as Allen (1988) asserts, predominantly white institutions must reevaluate and assess themselves and operate from a basis which affirms that they are multiracial, multiethnic - culturally plural - just as America is. Unless that happens, the prospect of success - increased academic achievement, increased graduation rates, and general satisfaction with college life - appears dim

for the minority groups, most especially for African Americans. Granted, multi-culturalism is not the sole, magic cure for all that ails higher education for minorities, but it seems to be a potent antidote that will help to heal the disease of institutional racism and promote the healthy growth of respect for members of various races and cultures. It is being concluded that this in turn will lead to greater success for minority students on predominantly white college campuses.

REFERENCES

Allen, W. (1988). Black students in U.S. higher education: Toward improved access, adjustment and achievement. Urban - Review, 20, 165-188.

Amos, W.E. and Grambs, J.D. (1968). Counseling the disadvantaged youth. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Astin, A.W. (1972). The measured effects of higher education. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 404, 1-20.

Bailey, R. (1978). Minority Admissions. Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Books.

Bloom, B.S. (1971). Mastery learning theory and Practice. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Wilson.

Boyer, E.L. (1983). High School: A Report on secondary education in America. New York: Harper and Row.

Bressler, M. (1967). White colleges and Negro higher education. Journal of Negro Education, 26, 258-265.

Claerbaut, D. (1978). Black student alienation: A study. San Francisco: R and E Research Associates, Inc.

Centra, J.A. (1970). Academic growth in predominantly Negro and predominantly White colleges. American Education Research Journal, 7, 83-98.

Chickering, A.W. (1969). Education and identity. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Civil Rights Act (1970). 42 United States Congress 2000d.

Clark, K. (1965). Dark ghetto. New York: Harper and Row.

Cunningham, J.V. and Tidwell, R. (1990). Cognitive - Developmental Counseling: Preparing low-income students for college. The School Counselor, 37, 225-229.

Cunningham, W. (April 22, 1990). Commitment to minorities: UT - Austin has strong policy against racism, program recruitment. Austin American-Statesman.

Fleming, J. (1984). Blacks in college. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gollnick, D.M. and Chinn, P.C. (1983). Multicultural education in a pluralistic society. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill Publishing Company.

Helwig, A. and Vidales, J. (1988). Minority and white counselor differences on needs assessment related to

career development. Texas Association for Counseling and Development Journal, 16, 51-57.

Hilgard, E.R. and Bower, G.H. (1966). Learning and the technology of instruction. Theories of Learning. New York: Appleton-Century-Crafts.

Hughes, L., Gordon, W. and Hillman, L. (1980). Desegregating America's Schools. New York: Longman, Inc.

Hyde, W.D., Jr. (1978). The effect of tuition and financial aid access and choice in postsecondary education. Issues in Postsecondary Education Finance. Education Commission of the States, 28-35.

Knowles, L. and Prewitt, K. (1969). Institutional Racism in America. Englewood, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Moss, K. (May 12, 1990). Beyond the stereotype: Fraternities fight to emphasize good, not the racist acts of some members. Austin American Statesman.

Myrick, R.D. (1987). Developmental Guidance and Counseling. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Educational Media Corporation.

National Association for the Advancement of Colored People Committee on Campus Troubles (1971). College and the black student NAACP tract. New York: National Advancement of Colored People.

Nieves, L. (1978). College achievement through self-help. New Jersey: Educational Testing Services.

Orfield, G. (1988). Exclusion of the majority: shrinking college access and public policy in metropolitan Los Angeles. The Urban-Review, 20, 147-162.

Ploski, H. and Williams, J. (1983). Perspectives on black education. The Negro Almanac: A reference on the Afro-American. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Shertzer, B. and Stone, S. (1971). Fundamentals of Guidance. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Sleeter, C. and Grant, C. (1988). Making choices for multicultural education: Five approaches to race, class and gender. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill Publishing Company.

Taylor, C. (1987). Effective ways to recruit and retain minority students. Madison, Wisconsin: Praxis Publications, Inc.

Tinto, V. (1975). Dropout from higher education: A theoretical synthesis of recent research. Research of Education Research, 45, 89-125.

University of Texas (1990). Black Faculty Caucus Proposal for Multiculturalism.

University of Texas - Austin, Office of Institutional Studies (1989). Undergraduate student flow chart by ethnicity and foreign status.

University of Texas - Austin, Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs (1988). Minority recruitment and retention programs.

Upcraft, M.L., Gardner, J.M. and Associates (1989). The freshman year experience: Helping students survive and succeed in college. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Upcraft, M.L. (1985). Residence halls and student activities. Increasing student retention: Effective programs and practices for reducing the dropout rate. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Wellman, D. (1977). Portraits of White Racism. Massachussetts: Cambridge University Press.

Williams, J. (1980). The State of Black America. National Urban League.

VITA

Elaine Smith was born in Galveston, Texas, on September 26, 1952. After graduating from Gould High School, Gould, Arkansas, in 1969, she entered The University of Arkansas in Pine Bluff, Arkansas. She received a Bachelor of Arts degree in English Education in May, 1973. She taught in the Memphis City Schools, Memphis, Tennessee and Little Rock City Schools, Little Rock, Arkansas. She began her graduate work at The University of Texas at Austin in June, 1987. She currently teaches social studies at Grisham Middle School in the Round Rock Independent School District.

Permanent address: 12015 Bobcat Trail
Austin, Texas
78750

This thesis was typed by Teresa Sheahan and Karen Traylor.